UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Humanity Goes On Strike - - - - - - - - - *George Lawrence Parker*

"Reveille for Radicals" - - - - - - - - - - *Leslie T. Pennington*

Democracy and Nature - - *W. S. Taylor*

Liberal Distinctions in Thought and Social Usage - - - - *John Malick*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXII NUMBER 1

Chicago, March, 1946

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

C. A. Hawley: Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, Kansas.

Fritz Karsen: Formerly Director of the Experimental Educational Institutions of the Weimar Republic in Berlin; now Lecturer in Education at City College, New York.

John Malick: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Duluth, Minnesota.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

George Lawrence Parker: Minister of the First Unitarian Church, Duxbury, Massachusetts.

Leslie T. Pennington: Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Chicago.

W. S. Taylor: Professor of Psychology, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts.

Eleanor Darnall Wallace: Member of the Board of Book Reviewers for the *Christian Advocate*.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 3

ARTICLES—

Humanity Goes on Strike—GEORGE LAWRENCE PARKER 4
"Reveille for Radicals"—LESLIE T. PENNINGTON 6
Democracy and Nature—W. S. TAYLOR 9
Liberal Distinctions in Thought and Social Usage—JOHN MALICK 10

POETRY—

Poets, Sing On!—ETHEL GERTRUDE STOWE 13
Victory—SHELDON SHEPARD 15

THE STUDY TABLE—

Democratic International Organization—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 13
The Courage of Jews—ELEANOR DARNALL WALLACE 14
Fateful Years—FRITZ KARSEN 15
Two Saints and a Man of Letters—C. A. HAWLEY 15

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 16

THE FIELD—

Peace Day in the United Nations—*Committee for Peace Day in the United Nations* 2

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Peace Day in the United Nations

We want your support for a Peace Day in the United Nations, an annual international holiday on which the people of the United Nations will pledge to one another, to the sacred dead, and to the generations yet to come, the achievement of a united world with liberty and justice for all.

Statesmen and leaders of governments have long realized that until the people of the world are committed to the cause of peace and until they have some common way of expressing this commitment, permanent peace will never be attained.

Treaties of peace are only promises made by governments, promises that can easily be ignored when self-interest so dictates. The promise of governments must be supported by the power of the moral convictions of the people. No single nation, however, can make peace by itself. Though peace can be broken by one nation, it can only be made and kept by many nations. An annual international Peace Day, celebrated in all the nations of the United Nations, crosses the boundaries of *nation, race, creed,* and unites the people of all nations in a solemn expression of their will.

The time has come to beat the drums and sound the brasses for peace instead of for war, to accept personal sacrifice for peace as readily as personal sacrifice for war. While pageantry can never be a substitute for practical measures in the conduct of international affairs, it can play a most important part in peace education. An annual international Peace Day offers an occasion upon which all these activities can be centered. It presents an unlimited opportunity to marshal the creative resources of every nation for—*Peace.*

An annual international Peace Day offers one means for the people of the world to express their will for peace in a united re-dedication. Each nation in its own tradition, each man in his own faith and tongue will make a solemn pledge: to maintain international peace and security.

Throughout the United Nations the observance of Peace Day will be most carefully planned. Every resource of education, every channel of communication, every influence of ritual and ceremony will be utilized to make Peace Day the united expression of the people's will for peace. Throngs of people in thousands of cities and towns joining their hearts and voices in worldwide rededication—these are the true guardians of the peace. Men and women gathered in their homes or meeting in schools, churches, and synagogues will have the opportunity to promise one another across the boundaries of nation, race, and creed that they, the people, have faith in each other and will keep the peace.

(*Continued on page* 14)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXXII MARCH, 1946 No. 1

EDITORIAL

In that now dim pre-war period we in America were in a state of ideological and emotional confusion and conflict. We were theoretically committed to democracy but we were actually practicing discrimination on a gigantic scale. This was incontrovertibly stated in *An American Dilemma,* in regard to the Negro. And similar volumes could elaborate and document this same dilemma in relation to other minorities, including Mexicans, Japanese-Americans, and Jews. In one breath we proclaimed the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, and quoted Jefferson and Lincoln with approval; and in the next spread rumors and insinuating jokes about minorities, advocated segregation, and fostered discrimination.

We condemned other nations for their Racism and at the same time cultivated the soil of an exclusive Nativism that had all the earmarks of the worst in Fascism. While proclaiming our democracy to the world we allowed the importation of Nazi and Fascist propaganda by the tons. We had an immature conception of what our own democracy involved, and we were shockingly careless about protecting ourselves from infectious centers abroad.

The result of all this was that we were becoming fertile soil for the growth of Fascism. I dislike to think of what would have happened in America if Hitlerism had triumphed in Europe—as it came very near doing. There were numbers of good people who were standing up for a broad and fine democracy and against the forces of intolerance. But anyone who thinks that we were not near the abyss of bigotry knows neither the Zenith Cities nor the Main Streets of America.

By a war which we did not want, we were given another chance to make good our ideals.

While it would be easy to over-idealize what happened to our minds during the recent state of war, we can safely say that at least on the surface, and to some extent at deeper levels, we experienced new commitments to democratic purposes. We pulled ourselves together and produced the greatest volume of goods in the shortest time ever known to any economy. After some controversy we agreed, at least in the higher circles of government and leadership, that discrimination in employment should be opposed. The Army and the Navy took some modest steps toward fairness and justice regarding minority groups. There was some shame over our treatment of Japanese-Americans. All in all, there was improvement in our conduct toward minorities, and civil liberties were better respected than many of us had dared hope.

There was a slow but easily discernible growth in our comprehension of the human values that were involved in the world struggle. We were slow and terribly inadequate in taking advantage of wartime conditions for the advancement of democratic education. We never really tackled the task of developing tolerance and freedom in a way commensurate with the opportunity afforded by the war. This is particularly true of our failure adequately to inform our armed forces what the war was all about.

But there was a quickening of conscience in regard to our shortcomings. We were a bit embarrassed over the discrepancy between our standards for other countries and our practice at home.

Perhaps the most noticeable change in our state of mind was the development of a sense of belonging to the world. Our sons and daughters were scattered over the earth; the mails were loaded with communications from and to everywhere; and places formerly remote seemed close at hand. We began to think that this is one world after all!

And then came what is perhaps too optimistically called a state of peace, and we passed into the post-war world.

With the coming of peace there was a rather sudden let-down in our feelings about the world in general, as if we had just realized that perhaps we had gone too far away from the home base. There was a weakening of our resolve to build a world of justice as well as of peace. The Fascist-like underground began to operate in the open. Pre-war ideology once more reasserted itself.

There was an upsurge of the old intolerance. Young people who had imbibed bigotry and prejudice at the home fireside began revolts in the public schools, and the halls of Congress again resounded with whoops of intolerance. I am not saying that the forces of liberty and justice and tolerance have capitulated; what I am saying is that such forces find themselves again compelled to take their places in the old battle line. I am afraid that most of us were about to forget how deep-

rooted in the American scene are anti-Semitism, white supremacy, and one-hundred-percentism.

Moreover, the very gains that were made in equality of opportunity during the war have frightened the foes of freedom, and caused them to redouble their efforts to restore the old ways. Those who have tasted new freedoms will never be content with less and will press for more. This in turn will cause more anti-democratic reaction; and it appears to be difficult to break the vicious circle.

Let there be no mistake, the native bigots are willing if necessary to go down fighting; and liberal forces, if they are to triumph, must be equally willing to go up fighting. Indeed, liberal forces should be more zealous than the forces of intolerance, for we represent genuine democratic purposes, and they represent the really subversive elements in American life.

We can take some encouragement from the fact that there is a residue of wartime idealism. Good resolutions have some carry-over. New human contacts are not easily forgotten. Factory co-workers and foxhole comrades make a permanent impression, regardless of color or nationality. You cannot fight for the liberty of other lands and wholly disdain liberty at home. You cannot consistently oppose the Hitlers of Europe and favor the Bilbos of America, for they are of the same pattern and are made from the same cloth.

CURTIS W. REESE.

Humanity Goes on Strike

GEORGE LAWRENCE PARKER

Humanity is out, perhaps down and out, on strike.

December 1945 and January 1946 will be noted by future economic historians as the "Time of the Great Epidemic." In the passing days we have of course counted our strikes one by one: General Motors; telephone workers; meat packers; and above all, steel. But finger-counting must yield to the larger summarizing that points out that so many exterior skin diseases indicate an unhealthy blood stream, and that it is not this group or that group that has walked out but humanity itself. The soldiers in Manila and Frankfurt have been infected; and even the school children at Four Corners are not immune.

Such a wholesale view, such a swallowing of our dose, might, conceivably, do two things for us. World infection is better material for diagnosis than isolated cases. This complete view might, first, drive us to the root of the matter. But more important still, it might give new meaning to the Gospel Preface: "Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

This famous and puzzling preface can easily be put into modern speech, and put much more simply. It would read thus: "Get a new point of view, for a new era is beginning," or "Change your mind, for a new period is at your door," or "Stop pouring the wine of new conditions into the wine bottles of ancient customs."

However we phrase it, there is genuine meaning in the old preface: "Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." By using familiar words it may at last enter our dull minds that in all the universe there is just one thing and only one thing that we can change, *our minds!* There is one and only one flexible instrument of truth and progress, one and only one adaptable tool for human emergencies; and that tool is the mind within us. We fully recognize this fact in life's minor details (if life has any minor details); and it is our practice to use a dozen times a day the slogan of repentance, "I have changed my mind." Without it we could not meet any unfolding piece of work, could not get fresh inspiration from any line of poetry or philosophy, could not note down in our laboratory notebooks the record of any special Kingdom of Heaven that passes our door. Our only hope of enticing our kingdoms to become permanent is our one instrument that is made for that very purpose, the changing responsive mind. Indeed, without this flexible endowment we would not be able to do even the commonest things that nature calls on us to do; we would not be able to have three different meals per day but would compulsorily eat breakfast foods for lunch and dinner. We would not change our minds by going to sleep, but would lie staringly awake every night and miss the jumping joy of new-made mornings. Without a change of mind we could not pass from kindergarten to school and college; for education is, after all, just the knowledge of how to change our mind in order to keep up with the processional facts of a moving living world. Along the whole road we are forever repenting because that is the only way to bid the Kingdom of Heaven to halt at our home.

Is it, then, impossible to conceive that the real Kingdom of Heaven, the total cooperative response between us and the Divine Order, is dependent on exactly this same kind of flexibility of mind? Take, for instance, the New Testament, its general tone if not all of its exact words. Is there any book that ever sprung from human insight which is so sensationally full of changes, surprises, hairbreadth escapes, thrilling dangers and rescues, soul-striving mysteries, as the New Testament? The conventional, cut-to-order, modern mystery story is but a clumsy Puss-in-Boots compared to this original Mystery Story of God's career among men. The winds of suspense, anticipation, and surprise that blew into the doors of humanity with the life of Jesus have not and cannot die down. The Conan Doyle School is stupidity of the nth degree in comparison with the New Testament's detective story of the Eternal mystery.

Well, has this anything to do with humanity's strike-mood of the present hour? Yes, "much every way" as Paul phrased it.

For humanity is on strike against the artificial nature of its own solidified mind, on strike as never before. Man longs for a change of conditions but is so "frozen" in his solidification that only with "groans and travail cries" will he consent to renovate his point of view. In a reverent parenthesis it may be said that the groan-and-travail-cry theory or picture is scarcely visible in the life and words of Jesus. Tragedy he did indeed face, and conquer; but the peaceful sweep of a mind and spirit attuned to a present Divine Reality made him sure of the possibility of goodness, sure of the substance

of peace, very careless of the agonizing that we usually ascribe to our struggle. He seems to have been hand-in-glove with a changing universe; fitted to a Divine Reality of Dynamic Action whom he confidingly called "Our Father." He discovered the atom of spiritual power at the heart of God and claimed it for his own and our own. Humanity is on strike today because, yearning for this secret, we reject the spiritually scientific assumptions that Jesus made about life and experience.

At this hour no one can listen to the cut-and-dried patched-up theories of existence with any satisfaction. We are in the tiresome platitude stage of our search for solutions. Reports from the U.N.O. in the past weeks have been full of such wise saws as "We must not expect it to be perfect." I have kept a record of many of the weary repetitions and they fill several diary pages. Anyone slightly aware of the shining novelty of New Testament wisdom can only smile at the belated wisdom of many of our world builders.

We have talked much in our modern times about the progress of man. We have tragically remained silent about the progress of God. I do not intend here to discuss theologically the Changelessness of God. But if by progress we mean purposeful movement, active wisdom, the flexibility of love, then surely we may and must speak of the progress of God. To disassociate man's progress from God's progress is to put asunder things that are forever united. To overlook this unity of all progress is to live in a house divided against itself; which is but to repeat the courteous way in which Jesus said that schizophrenia or split-personality is our chief threat.

That man can "go it alone" is the most tragic assumption of our human situation. The wild recklessness with which man cuts loose his mental life from the Parent Mentality Back of the Universe is our supreme error; to call that Parent Mentality "Our Father which art in Heaven" is our supremest sanity. Growing children always demand a growing and developing parent; and Angelo Patri is not far behind James Russell Lowell in stating that "You've got to get up early if you're goin' to take in God." In the same procession of flexibilists is Henri Bergson with his philosophy of vitalism or *elan vital.* At the head of that procession, from Heraclitus with his "eternal flux" down to the moderns, stands Jesus with his simple quiet remark that "no man puts new wine into old wine bottles, lest the new fermentation burst the old bottles and both be lost," and his equally striking statement that "the scribe instructed in the Kingdom of Heaven bringeth forth out of his treasure things old and new."

Now it is fatally wrong to call such vitalism, radicalism. The most conservative thing on my desk and in my daily living is my watch, just because it tells the same time, at the same time, all the time!

But my watch is reliable only as it keeps moving; it is conservative, literally "keeps the time," because forever changing the time. Humanity is on strike today because instead of repenting each moment, as the watch does, we lag behind the hour-glass of eternity. There is an evident time lag between our best modern knowledge and our adjustment of spiritual insight to it.

It is against this status quo that all mankind is on strike. The quarrel is between Management and Labor in the conduct of the universe. That "we are workers together with God" is not taken seriously. Rejecting the program laid down by Jesus, we continue to live in a divided or schizophrenic house. There are two choices before us. Either there will be a stalemate of indefinite duration between man and God, which will destroy our hope of progress; or else there must be a change of mind which will discover the Kingdom of Heaven at our door, a full-time repentance.

There is only one other possible choice. Some call it revolution. But for myself I see little profit in revolution so long as it is the same old wheel that revolves. Revolution of the average kind means a change of formulas, for the most part; little else. Repentance means not a change of clothes but of the mind itself. This is the kind of revolution for which Jesus prayed. The tones of "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done" are not the tones of a wild upsetter but the tones of a laboratory scientist. His direction for prayer, so often quoted as if in a field by itself, "When thou prayest enter into thy closet and shut the door, and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee" is a plain laboratory classroom direction. It can, without the least straining, be translated, "When you wish to make requests of the universe, go into your laboratory, concentrate on the facts and the law of those facts; and the universe will answer you."

Of course the answer of the physical laboratory and the spiritual laboratory is not the same. The material is different; but the discovery and application of law is alike. In the spiritual laboratory we deal with our cosmic facts, personality, destiny, character, righteousness, love, hope, fear, the soul in all its rational and emotional phases. In the physical laboratory we deal with great things, too, and frequently these companionably dovetail with and lap over into the spiritual. But our danger now is that, amazed by our success, we shall conceive of the scientific method as a convenience only, and thus have on our hands nothing more than a gadgetary universe while the world of inner realities, our native cosmic home, recedes into the dim distance, perhaps forever. Paul eloquently saw the process—"The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, waiting for the adoption, that is the redemption of our body." The melting of the physical and the spiritual into one integrated whole. "Wholism," as Gen. Jan Smuts called it long ago, is the final purpose of creation.

Let me apologize here for a very brief aside at this point; one that should not be so shortly treated. Two remarks: The first is that the new mind which came in 1859 with *The Origin of Species* is akin to the repentance that Jesus taught so simply eighteen hundred and fifty-nine years earlier. The idea of evolution, whatever its final facts may be, should never have become a bogey-man, for it is implicit in all that Jesus said. And the second remark is this: In August, 1945, we came to another repentance; everything changed with one shot of the atomic bomb; we either had to "repent or we should all likewise perish." The atom now is not only scientifically "split" but is actually involved in a domestic family quarrel within itself; domestic strife is tearing the Atom Family to pieces; "its foes are they of its own household." The good side of the family says: "Use the atom for peace only." The bad side of the family says: "It is the greatest war instrument ever known; let us keep it for ourselves." In other words, the atom has not escaped the inevitable battle between good and evil which exists in the whole realm of nature, exists there at least until the cosmic and heavenly reality adopts and redeems the gadgetary and the earthly temporalities.

In fine, the challenge to change our minds is no longer the cry of a gentle peasant-teacher by "cool Siloam's shady rill" but a voice of universal atomic power shouting out across the world: "Change your minds; repent; the Kingdom of Heaven or of Destruction is at hand."

Humanity is on strike against its own rusty, creaky mind which finds it hard to thus so quickly shift gears. But we surely can remember that we have shifted in ages past. We need not fear to do so now. Moses led one of the greatest strikes in history and out of it brought the revolutionary Ten Commandments. The Hebrew prophets of 800 B.C. were, in large degree, strike leaders. The Renaissance and the Reformation were strikes after the wholesale pattern. Call the roll from Copernicus to Einstein, the story is about the same; relativity instead of stability, flexibility instead of immovability, is the basic principle. The strike motif or movement is native to the methods of God. Evidently God takes no sides in any dispute; what He does is to urge all to go forward together.

To follow him does not brand any man as radical. Rather does it name him, us, as the true conservatives or conservators. We accept the full meaning of the term Salvation in its spiritual sense because we catch the hint that we are only saved by movement, just as a ship at sea is only saved by its ever-shifting compass; lose the unsteady compass and you lose the ship.

If education in the post-war world is to be a factor in human salvation, let it begin now with a new charter based on the nature of the mind itself. If spiritual insight is to be the largest factor in our salvation, in the driver's seat alongside education, let that spiritual insight—yes, the churches themselves—bring forth into clear light the inevitableness of the total sweep of the significance of Jesus, placing the core of his teaching among the cosmic tides instead of among the rippling brooks of a quiet glade—however intimate may be the relation between brooks and tides. Our only security against a gadgetary universe is to take religion in cosmic terms.

To restrict all of this to labor troubles, and to them alone, is another bit of gadgetry. The strike is of and by humanity, not by bits of humanity angry because underpaid. We are all on strike!

And our strike is justified if it measures up to the cosmic scale; otherwise it is not justified. The Kingdom of Heaven will not come with an added eighteen cents per hour in the pay envelope. The Kingdom will only come when we have spiritualized the strike-mood; when we have increased our spiritual earnings rather than our monetary earnings, although the two are companions in arms.

It seems plain today that the only real U.N.O. is a "United New Order" rather than an organization. It must be created and controlled by a new mind-set, led forward by laboratory repentance of spirit.

"Reveille for Radicals"*

LESLIE T. PENNINGTON

If democracy is to endure we shall need to establish a new and more direct working relationship between a free religious faith and a free society, between education in our great universities and the life of all the people. We Unitarians must never forget that we are in three ways the heirs of Thomas Jefferson—of his faith in Unitarian Christianity, in political democracy, and in education as the essential servant of the people. He believed in the dynamic integration of these three: a free faith, a free society, a free education.

The first thing which I like about Saul Alinsky's *Reveille for Radicals* is that it has arisen from his endeavor to bring his education in the social sciences at the University of Chicago directly to bear upon the life of our people in one of the worst blighted areas of this great metropolitan center. He has not used his education to escape from the problems of our people but to find their solution. He has attacked the issues of modern civilization freshly, in their most acute form. This is not just another book, but one which springs from hot, practical, hard-hitting experiments in building People's Organizations which are now going concerns in several American industrial centers.

The book opens with an emotional identification of the author with the American people after the manner of John Steinbeck. He takes his stand with the Revolutionists from Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Paine on down. They are the real servants of the people, the dynamic force which alone can keep democracy alive. Alinsky's key term is "Radical." He believes that the Radical is the hope of democracy. It has been suggested that he took the term in answer to the challenge of President Conant's much-discussed article in the *Atlantic Monthly* of a few years ago: "Wanted—American Radicals." "American Radicals," he says, "are to be found wherever and whenever America moves close to the fulfillment of its democratic dream."

In so far as he is moved by religious faith, it is in the generic terms of the Franciscan prayer and the words of Schiller:

> "Lord, make me an instrument of Thy Peace: where there is hatred, let me sow love: where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; where there is sadness, joy."
>
> "Know this, a mind sublime puts greatness into life, yet seeks it not therein."

Many of the basic aims of Mr. Alinsky's Radical are held in common with the Liberal, although he is so eager to set one over against the other that he does not concede the point. The Liberal is also possessed by the passion for sincerity. For him the "common good is the greatest personal value." He "genuinely and completely believes in mankind," wants a world "where the worth of the individual is recognized . . . where man could live in dignity, security, happiness, and peace—a world based on a morality of mankind . . . where there is real equality of opportunity regardless of race, creed, color." He, too, believes in social planning from "the bottom up," rather than from "the top down," and beyond economic security is concerned that our way of life shall satisfy "the creative desires of all men."

But Mr. Alinsky is savage in his denunciation of the Liberal. He is in full cry against the Liberal for the detachment of his thinking from the deep-seated feeling

*Reveille for Radicals. *By Saul Alinsky. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.* 228 *pp.* $2.50.

and the deep-seated action relevant and essential to the intense struggle for power which dominates the modern world. "Liberals like people with their head. Radicals like people with both their head and their *heart.*" Liberals are stalled in balanced judgment, paralyzed by ethical dilemmas, frozen in the immobility of objectivity, caught in the backwash of agreeing with objectives while disagreeing with tactics. They are unwilling to begin with conditions as they are. They have both feet planted firmly in mid-air. They are unable to see and feel from the inside the plight, the dire necessity, and the suffering of the people. The great causes for which Mr. Alinsky would fight with all the intensity of his being are to the Liberals "simply intellectual affinities." "They are not living in rotten houses; it is not their children who are sick; it is not they who are working with the spectre of unemployment hanging over their heads; they are not fighting their own fight."

This is the old distinction of Jonathan Edwards between "notional knowledge" and the "knowledge of due appreciation." The Liberals are suffering from notional knowledge. Here Mr. Alinsky has put his iron on the greatest weakness of liberalism, and I hope that he will burn it in until Liberals are stung to a new awareness and action. He exposes with justice and with power the evils of moral duplicity and compromise in virtually every group in society—not omitting racial and national minorities, organized labor, and the church.

The place of the Radical today is in the labor movement. This he maintains in spite of the fact that organized labor has become an adjunct to monopoly capitalism. He castigates labor for attempting to secure its own interest at the expense of technological advance, for creating an artificial scarcity of its own product—labor, for entering a working partnership with monopoly capitalism, for serving political bosses and machines, for policies of racial segregation. But in spite of all these evils the place of the American Radical is in the labor movement.

> He knows that the labor movement merely by virtue of the size of its membership is much more representative than any other organized-interest action group in the national scene. He knows too that, regardless of the perversion of labor's principles by an undemocratic leadership, in the last analysis the mass base and membership constantly exerts a progressive pressure upon the course of the labor movement.

But the movement must learn to think of the whole complex of American society beyond its own special interest of wages and hours, and learn to work for the welfare of all the people.

Mr. Alinsky is at his best in his analysis of the present crisis in democracy.

> In our modern urban civilization, multitudes of our people have been condemned to urban anonymity—to living the kind of life where many of them neither know nor care about their own neighbors. They find themselves isolated from the life of their community and their nation, driven by social forces beyond their control into little individual worlds in which their own individual objectives have become paramount to the collective good. Social objectives, social welfare, the good of the nation, the democratic way of life—all these have become nebulous, meaningless, sterile phrases.
>
> This erodes the very foundations of democracy . . . Millions of people feel deep down in their heart of hearts that there is no place for them—that they do not count. . . .
>
> When we turn our attention to the people we are confronted with one issue. This issue is so deep, so broad, so intense, that it far transcends any of the other problems which we think of as the ills of mankind. . . . It is the awakening of our people from the abysmal apathy which has resulted in the decay and breaking down of a large part of those few ideals which mankind has so desperately clung to.

To give to the people a new sense of their responsibility, dignity, and worth as human beings and citizens of democracy, Mr. Alinsky would have the Radical work directly with the people themselves, forming People's Organizations through which they can shape their own destiny and future.

The second two-thirds of the book is on "The Building of People's Organizations."

Since "the present power age defines and evaluates everything in terms of power," his purpose is to create People's Organizations so strong, so powerful that they can achieve their own ends. The conventional community agency is based upon two fallacies: (1) It views each problem as independent of all others. (2) It assumes that the problem can be solved in terms of the isolated community. Against these Mr. Alinsky would have his People's Organizations begin with specific problems on the community level and *follow through.* Following through on a specific problem, they are forced to confront the whole complex of community power. Beginning with the study of crime they are led to the whole broad vista of social disorganization: unemployment, undernourishment, disease, deterioration, demoralization. And the powers involved transcend the limits of the community, are city-wide, state-wide, nation-wide. Therefore the local People's Organization must unite with other People's Organizations in widening circles until they are commensurate in power with the evils which they face.

It is imperative that the organizations shall be based upon native and indigenous leadership and built from within, in line with the existing traditions and organizations of the community. In every community there are native leaders to each of whom some twenty or forty families instinctively and habitually turn for guidance. It is the task of the organizer to discover and base his organization upon these; without them he labors in darkness and in vain. But an organization of these indigenous leaders can swing whole neighborhoods and communities into a movement of mass power. The purpose of the movement is to gather into a representative and democratically controlled organization the indigenous leadership of all existing community movements without discrimination of color, creed, nationality, or interest: labor, business, industry, fraternal, service, nationality, athletic, religious—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish. The organization becomes something of a cross between a public welfare organization and a political machine, skilled in all the techniques of social, political, and economic conflict.

There are illuminating chapters on organizational and conflict tactics. The organizers do not hesitate to appeal to selfish motives and pressures to secure cooperation, in faith that work within such a representative group will awaken the hardest heart to public service and the common good. Mr. Alinsky himself says:

> In our war against the social menaces of mankind there can be no compromise. It is life or death. Failing to understand this, many well-meaning Liberals look askance and with horror at the *viciousness* with which the People's Organization will attack or counter-attack in its battles.

This movement comes very close to being the organized implementation of the insights of Lincoln Steffens. We are given an account of an interview between one of the organizers and "one of the most ruthless political machine bosses in the country." The organizer, convinced of failure, was astonished to receive this reply:

> "There was another young feller that came to this town about thirty or more years ago. He tried to sell me just about the same bill of goods that you're giving me. His name was—let me see—it was—oh, yes, a feller by the name of Lincoln Steffens. I turned him down, but I'm going to play ball with you and I'll tell you why. This feller, Lincoln Steffens, figured that every man was real good and all you had to do was to give him a chance to be better and, by Jiminy, he would be better. But you—(Old Uncle Bill chuckled), you, young man, you believe every man and woman has got a little bit of larceny in their hearts and you're using that larceny to make them better in spite of themselves and you're damn right! Go ahead."

Mr. Alinsky claims a record of five to seven per cent popular participation in his People's Organizations, compared with one-fourth of one per cent in ward politics, one per cent in the C.I.O., one per cent in churches, and fifty per cent in Moscow.

Any movement which claims so much for itself and has been so widely acclaimed by the press, merits the discriminating study and critical evaluation of the Liberals whom Mr. Alinsky attacks. I commend the following for your consideration:

1. Mr. Alinsky seems to get at the root of one of the gravest evils in modern democratic society: the sense of the lostness, futility, and hopelessness of innumerable urban people. This is why we should subject his program to the acid of criticism.

2. The account of organizational and conflict tactics is revealing. They include "the viciousness with which the People's Organization will attack and counter-attack" and a great deal of the Dale Carnegie method of "winning friends and influencing people." He comes very close to the doctrine that the end justifies the means, that it is right to lie and apply ruthless social pressure for a good end.

Who is going to determine the methods used and against whom they are to be used? If you once break away from principle, as he himself writes, there is no end to the evil in which you become involved. And yet in the tactics here proposed, he does break away from principle.

3. The fact is that in the name of sound principle he has flagrantly and rightly exposed the compromise, duplicity, selfishness, and weakness of every group and organization in society *except his own.* He needs to remember those words of Lord Acton: "Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely." People's Organizations are no more exempt from the rule than religious or labor organizations. Many a people's organization before him has been destroyed by its failure to recognize this principle.

It is significant that he has worked extensively and has been most widely acclaimed by Roman Catholics whose influence in history, at least in one of their major Orders, has seemed to bear with it the doctrine that the end justifies the means. So far we have no record that he has crossed the Catholic Church in one of its major policies. Those of us who have seen it so crossed have seen it threaten the very foundations of freedom in democracy by the same pressures which Mr. Alinsky advocates and employs. Mr. Alinsky would save democracy: but here he advocates the pressures which may destroy it, with no adequate statement of the balancing principles essential to its very life.

4. Without these principles Mr. Alinsky's insistence upon native and indigenous leadership may produce a provincial sectionalism as disastrous to his own movement as the provincialism which he has so rigorously denounced in others. The tactics used by the Back of the Yards Council in its attack on the University of Chicago Settlement, whatever the merits of the basic social philosophies involved, revealed the perils of undisciplined sectionalism. Much in the area philosophy and program of social organization is challenging, but the objective method of scientific social work is still more reliable than the methods of ward politicians. There is no one perfect way of organizing society, not even the People's Organizations. What we need is the integration of new movements with existing institutions, not the destruction of either.

5. This raises the question as to where Mr. Alinsky is going. His answer would be, I assume: "Wherever the People's Organizations lead." To which we may reply: "Or are led." We know where he is not going—toward monopoly capitalism. This he condemns, and with it "free enterprise." "Free enterprise" has today become a popular shibboleth behind which many advocates of monopoly capitalism are masquerading. But in the true meaning of the term, would Mr. Alinsky be willing to destroy all free enterprise while endeavoring at the same time to save democracy? The ways which he seems to have left open for himself are the corporate state, Socialism, Communism.

Now there are fifty-seven shades of capitalism, just as there are fifty-seven shades of Socialism, and about twenty-eight-and-a-half of each overlap. In the same way there are fifty-seven shades of Radicals and fifty-seven shades of Liberals with an equal amount of overlapping. Within these shades Mr. Alinsky will have to define his terms and his principles much more clearly before we really know what he means or where he is going.

If he was influenced in the selection of his title by President Conant's "Wanted—American Radicals," we hope he did not overlook the sequel to that article, "The Search for the Democratic Man," by M. H. Hedges of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. There was one religious insight pointed out by the man of labor relations which the President of Harvard missed.

> The old Calvinism [he wrote] frankly faced the problem of the savage depth in all men. The old Calvinism did not divide the world between capitalists and labor, Nazi and free men, Fascists and Communists, but between the self-disciplined and the wayward.

Before we follow Mr. Alinsky and the People's Organizations very far we really want to know whether they belong to the self-disciplined or the wayward.

We really want to know about this, for Mr. Alinsky has laid hold of something so fundamental, so realistic, and so pertinent to the struggle for power in which democracy has become immersed—whether we like it or not—that we cannot afford to ignore either his diagnosis or his prescription. The question which he raises must be answered; and Liberals dissatisfied with his answer, if they are really to lead this age, cannot escape the responsibility of providing an answer of their own, an answer not in abstract theory, but wrought into the tissues of the common life of the American People.

Democracy and Nature*

W. S. TAYLOR

Many people seem to think that democracy derives from a supernatural world, and that democracy is therefore contrary to nature. From that point of view "justice for all" is democratic, while "dog eat dog" is wholly unrelated to the democratic.

When, however, we contrast democracy with anarchy and despotism, and see what democracy essentially is, we find that democracy is a natural and superior development.

Anarchy means, in brief, that each person should do as he pleases.

Despotism is primarily a defense against anarchy, and means that each person should do what the despot pleases.

Democracy is primarily a defense against despotism. This appears in many traditional statements of democracy. For example: "Freedom has a thousand charms to show. That slaves, howe'er contented, never know." "A free multitude is guided more by hope than fear; a conquered one, more by fear than hope; inasmuch as the former aims at making use of life, the latter but at escaping death." "Liberty, equality, fraternity." "The worth and dignity and creative capacity of the individual." "All for each and each for all." "Government of the people, by the people, for the people."

Quite likely, as Bellamy suggested, the founders of democracy were more aware of getting away from despotism than of approaching something else. What that something is, is revealed considerably in the characteristic practices of democracy.

Apparently every genuine democracy attempts to realize the following practices: maximal freedom for each individual, considering all individuals; free competition of ideas; essential education for all; majority control of laws and governors, including, ultimately, majority choice of any constitution, bill of rights, or "law above the laws"; government by law; individual equality before the law; recognition of individual differences in capacities; individual responsibility according to capacity; reward, in satisfaction at least, according to use of capacity; fellow feeling; advancement of truth, beauty, and goodness; and achievement of harmonious happiness.

The statements and the practices of democracy reveal trends which show what democracy is from three points of view, namely, individual, social, and cosmic.

From the individual point of view, democracy is the way for every person to live as fully and richly, to have as much individual power, perfection, and happiness, to be as well-developed a person, as possible. Thus democracy is *the way for every person to be his best.*

The immature person tries to be his best through satisfying, by his own efforts, his selfish interests. He learns, however, that to be one's best requires help both from and to others. Accordingly, from the social point of view, democracy is *cooperative self-realization.*

Cooperative self-realization means sharing in constructive enterprise. Such enterprise may be primarily religious, as in the early Congregational churches; political, as in the early United States; economic, as in the mutual insurance companies and the cooperative societies; educational, as in certain adult study groups; recreational, as in various sports organizations; or a combination of interests, as in the later democratic nations. Whatever the enterprise or the combination of enterprises, in so far as it is constructive, it is a part, and a most creative part, of evolution. Accordingly, from the cosmic point of view, democracy is *sharing in creative evolution.*

These three definitions of democracy are really synonymous: broadly considered, the way for every person to be his best is through cooperative self-realization, which means sharing in creative evolution; and sharing in creative evolution means cooperative self-realization, the way for every person to be his best. Moreover, each of the definitions formulates living, living most abundantly. It follows that the three definitions can be reduced to one, namely: *Democracy is the most progressive living.*

If democracy reduces to the most progressive living, then, since all living is concerned with some form of survival, democracy must make for survival. Democracy does make for survival more surely than does any other mode of living.

Democracy makes for survival because it makes individuals and groups most fit to survive. More than any other system, democracy makes self-directing men, men who develop and defend themselves, their group, and their larger interests, steadfastly and intelligently. Also, more than any other system, democracy makes an enlightened group, a group in which each individual enjoys a place, understands the group needs, and works together with his fellows in common interests.

Democracy makes for survival particularly through replacing physical struggle with ideational struggle, through the free competition of ideas. Darwin pointed out that continental species are more robust than island species, because continents support larger numbers, hence allow more favorable variations to appear and survive. In like manner, a democracy is an intellectual continent, smaller or larger according to how inclusive and complete the democracy is; a continent which encourages ideas to grow up and compete freely, that the best may survive and help the democracy to survive. Any despotism, on the other hand, is an intellectual island which allows relatively few ideas to grow up, and consequently reduces the struggle between ideas and gains less help from them. In this respect any despotism, from the despotism of "only one party and only one policy within the party" to the despotism of the toughest dictator, is on a level with a conventional finishing school in which immature minds are protected from tabooed ideas. Democracy is more realistic, robust, and adaptable.

Democracy makes for survival also through its advantage in understanding other systems. Every democrat understands anarchy and despotism. He has observed them both, sometimes in himself, and often at the zoo, in barnyards, among immature persons, and in mature persons who have regressive moods if not psychoses. The democrat understands anarchy and despotism much as the normal person understands color-blindness; namely, through observing grays himself and seeing how the color-blind take the world to be gray. Through understanding color-blindness, the

*Based largely on an article entitled "The Essence of Democracy," which appeared in the November, 1945, issue of the *Journal of Social Psychology.*

normal person becomes a more confirmed seer of colors. Likewise through understanding anarchy and despotism, the democrat becomes a more confirmed democrat. The converse, however, is not true: the despotist, for example, cannot really understand democracy and remain a despotist, any more than a color-blind person can understand colors and remain color-blind. Except when abnormally deprived of vision, to understand colors is to be a seer of colors. Likewise, to understand democracy is to be a democrat, eager to defend and advance democracy against contrary tendencies.

Finally, democracy itself tends to survive through its great propensity to inherit the earth, not for special individuals or a favored group but for all individuals, the world group. This does not mean that democracy is a word which can dissolve all problems of overpopulation, ambition, and other individual and group conflicts. It means that the democrat is most fitted to understand that a weed is a plant for which man has not found a use; that a human enemy represents failure to discover common interest; and that, in Spinoza's phrase, "nothing is so useful to man as man." It means, too, that other nations are far more willing to be absorbed by a democracy than by a despotism.

Evidently democracy embodies what Ralph Barton Perry calls "the creed of harmonious happiness. . . [This creed] invites a complete disclosure of the actual interests of men and of the causes by which they may be most abundantly satisfied. . . It represents the one common enterprise in which all men have a stake."

Liberal Distinctions in Thought and Social Usages

JOHN MALICK

Locating Unitarians and other liberals in the American church picture, they all belong to the "unsaved." With them are one-half of the United States. The "saved" churches are not in agreement about these figures. Some make them larger, some smaller. This "unsaved" group makes the Home Mission Field. Listed with these liberals are those under the other religions of the world. This is the Foreign Mission Field.

There are two counts in the indictment of Unitarians and the other "unsaved" they do not believe the right thought and they do not keep themselves sufficiently unspotted from the world. That is, one indictment is about theology, the other what goes by the name morality or social usages. Unitarians and other liberals do have different thought about all that is beyond the range of anyone's knowledge. On these matters, about which all have to be in doubt, they lean to the side of generous probability. While opinions are individual, Unitarians speak about the same language as Universalists, Ethical Culturists, Hicksite Quakers, Reformed Jews, Humanists, Rationalists, and Bahais. One from any one of these groups would feel at home in the others.

All these have certain presuppositions. One is that the part of the world man did not make is presumably all right, if not all one might wish, at least it has to be to make and to run this kind of world. A generous creation naturally suggests generous living, with clear conscience and gratitude. To all these groups the rich provisions of earth are not a mistake. Some think of them as probably intended. To all liberals the real atheism is to condemn the world by disuse.

The working words for the two groups, and the real basis of division, are "worldly" and "unworldly," rather than theology about which most people now are not very clear. This fear of the world in Western religion comes from one literature and history. The "saved" churches are its propagandists. By their reading, history is successively putting the human race on probation. One was from Adam to Noah, the next from Noah to the Crucifixion. The time since is said to be the final probation period, the last chance of the human race on the earth. Unitarians and most other liberals reject all this entirely as an interpretation of history and as a forecast of things yet to come. By necessity a probationer is bound to take life a certain way. He is out under suspicion with a record against him. He can be called back any time. He is not a free citizen and may be picked up for doing what others could do unchallenged. Liberals think of themselves as free citizens in a well-stocked world. They do not have the probationer mind as they have not the probationer condition. They naturally would use more of the world and use it in a much freer way. The "saved" always have lived more timidly with so much of the world forbidden territory. But the difference between the ways the two groups take the world has never been as much as one logically would expect. It is always a surprise, and a disappointment, to have liberals acting so much like those upon a wholly different foundation of fact.

Part of the answer is that for many centuries the "unsaved" have had their life made for them by the "saved." Only for short periods in a few places have they been able to live under their own thought. They have been under the whip hand of the "saved" who imposed their kind of theology and their brand of morals. There have been a few Rule of the Saints periods when conditions were more barren and unlovely than usual, as under Calvin in Geneva and Cromwell in England. Luther was a monastery man under rules that permitted using only a small part of the world. He came out not with the conviction that more of the world should be used but that all should be "monasticized" down to the rules of the order that he had left. Luther's influence spread widely over North Europe and established itself in spots over the world.

How do religionists react to different kinds of conduct? There is one layer where the agreement is general, as about stealing and murder. It is difficult to say just how far religion influenced this layer or was influenced by it. There were written laws about it one thousand years before Moses. Just by trying it out, people very early found that some conduct made life impossible. Whatever life itself had taught them, they made more authoritative still by adding their "god said." We are in the "god said" tradition, "Thou shalt not kill." China has the same code without the "god said."

Then there is another layer of human conduct about which there is no single religious position in the sense that all religionists agree. These are lumped now as "social questions," all about how people live, their

houses, wages, profit, prices, and such. There is no single "Christian" position in such matters. Certain social conditions obtain in Europe and the two Americas, all Christian territory, with Christians on both sides. Take land and labor conditions in old Russia, Poland, Spain, Mexico in our own Southland, all soundly Christian territory. Discussion goes on whether Catholics or Protestants are more alert to these questions, but there is no single Christian position with all on one side. There is no Christian position on the larger social evils. Christians, both kinds, may be found heading them and protesting them.

Then there is another layer in which there is no uniformity in world religions or among Christians. These are social usages that may rank as morality but evidently are thought to have little doctrinal significance for salvation. They were not put into the creeds but into the by-laws, the church books of discipline. It is always quite proper for a religious body to put stiff requirements upon its own people, such as no meat on Friday. The state is not concerned. One may be a good citizen without meat any day or with meat every day. This country gives full protection to religionists to put hard rules on their own members. They may put their heads, inside and out, in special denominational hoods of their own. They may forbid them to read newspapers or to ride in automobiles. There are some limits to the rules that churches may put on their own. They might put so little into their heads that the state would be affected. They might put such ideas into their heads that a state could not tolerate and remain a state at all. This limit was reached in France, Russia, Spain, and Mexico. Likely we are approaching the time when what some churches put into the heads of their members cannot be allowed. George Bernard Shaw enumerates some of the things that a state cannot permit to be taught indefinitely.

In this layer, about which there is no uniform religious practice, is all of life in which sex is a factor. Church thought about sex in creed and book of discipline was established when little was known about it, before science and Freud. They did what they could on their information. The general position was that sex should be scotched whenever it raised its head. All Scripture was written when it was so viewed. The attitude of Jesus to it, in the story of the woman taken in adultery, stands out by itself in understanding tolerance not reached in the part of the Bible that came before nor in the part that came after. About the only direct command in this field is about divorce. This has been much more strictly obeyed than most of his other sayings. Liberals might agree with Christians sometimes about the social effect of sex in play, book, or picture, or about the boy-girl, man-woman relations, but never would agree for the Christian's reasons. Liberals list sex as a major life drive, never as a mistake of creation or an unclean thing for temptation and punishment. This gives all liberals a different approach to anything in which sex is involved. Liberals generally would remove considerable sex legislation from city ordinances, state codes, and federal statutes. Some of these stem directly from the Bible and books of church discipline, all by necessity pre-scientific.

Theatre is in this field. About it there is no uniform religious or Christian position. One's feeling about it likely depends on his social background, where he was reared, the whole cultural setting. At times the church had the only theatricals. At other times it put its heavy hand upon the theatre when it got out of bounds of church proprieties. The church has been the patron of drama as well as its censor. This country was settled by Englishmen at a time when England was living under the rule of the saints. Only one kind of Puritan came here and not the theatre kind. The names that became household words in pioneer cabin, crossroad hamlet, and small town were the smaller stature, theological evangelistic kind such as Luther, Calvin, and Wesley, and not the larger caliber men such as Erasmus, Rabelais, and Shakespeare. We got the Protestant Reformation and not the European Renaissance, which represented the new kind of civilized life. While theatre has been on the proscribed list, it never has been a very live issue with the churches. Over most of the territory there never has been enough theatre even for a temptation.

Church discipline here centered upon tobacco, gambling, and drink. These made the standard for the good life and the good husband. There never has been any agreement about how to deal with them. Any position taken about either would have Christians on its side. Some religionists treat all three as almost deadly sins. Among other Christians neither is required to be reported in the Confessional. Most who have been around considerably treat all three as matters of taste not to be mentioned in condemnation or commendation where good social forms are respected. Drink and gambling are responsible for a lot of bad feeling and ill-considered legislation in cities, with Protestants always working to put their church rules into city ordinances. Catholics, the Jewish people and most liberals, under all the names, usually are on the other side. Many Protestants join this opposition at the polls, whatever they say to their ministers. In most cities the church vote is not decisive. It registers more decibels of sound between elections than volume of votes at the polls. Both gambling and drink are here for the lifetime of all living now, and they are to be dealt with realistically by those who know about such things, and not by theological moralists who of all people know least about them. The temper of the American people now is running against them. By a decisive vote recently, the whole country rejected them as untrustworthy guides of national and city affairs.

Most of life is taking a chance. Part of this general experience is called gambling. Part listed under the name is pure chance, mathematically. Just the laws of it are not known. In some gambling, skill is added to the mathematical chance, as the player wins both with the cards he draws and the skill with which he manipulates them. This taking a chance on a little to win more, or with nothing to win something, is a major drive as sex is. One does not begin to understand gambling until he knows this and approaches it from this angle, as he cannot begin to understand sex until he knows it as a major life drive and approaches it from this angle. It is this drive, taking a chance, that moves explorer and pioneer. It is back of the development of new territory and business enterprises. There is little difference in kind between the fellows playing their stakes on their little machines and those playing their larger stakes on the larger industrial machines and on the stock exchange. The theologians and moralists usually concentrate their fire on the little fellows. It takes more courage to go after the players for large stakes. It is our most conspicuous example of class legislation. This taking a chance cannot be eradicated; it can be

sublimated into other social channels. There is a large body of literature about hazarding on a chance, both large and small size, drawn from several fields, the exact and the social sciences. Any city that really wants to deal with it effectively would sit down with this material, study it and the parts of the country that have not depended upon the "clamp down, close it up" way of the moralists. No country ever has succeeded in shutting it out entirely except by religious threats worse than the thing itself. It is about the one kind of law that even England does not succeed in enforcing. It is a strange situation at a City Council meeting to have only one profession represented, and the very one that by training and experience knows least about it. There are a number of departments of human knowledge that have a lot of new stuff about how to handle it.

In our time we have cracked two units, one the atom, the basic unit of our physical world, and the home, the basic unit of our social life. Both have come very recently and no one knows just what the effect is going to be. There are no statistics and no history to guide. Cracking the atom engenders fear among men traditionally responsible for the welfare of the earth, and cracking the home engenders fear among women traditionally responsible for the young. Many of these women are in an outdated Bible stage and go to one book for all the answers. In the Bible only one kind of home, at one time, is represented. It is the Jewish home, self-contained, with two controls, home and synagogue, before both were cracked by the new freedom. The home is no longer a controlled experiment. The forces playing upon it are quite out of reach of any single home. In this changed situation homes are ineffective. More and more, schools, churches, and public authorities are asked to take over.

The Bible is not specific in its direction about how to deal with matters that were not in existence when it was written. We should not know just what verses of what chapters to suggest to General Motors and the Union bearing directly upon their difficulty. There is a lot of good general advice about doing as you would be done by, and about remembering that one always is his brother's keeper. This kind of teaching is about the same in all great religions. It falls far short of specific direction for most modern problems. People generally have not found a clear program in their Bible. The votes-for-women advocates, of course, got no help whatsoever for their side in a book written in the Orient before either men or women thought of voting. The anti-slavery people gave up trying to find arguments in a book written when slavery was the accepted and never protested. The prosecution of the Church of Latter Day Saints for polygamy had to meet defense counsel quoting Bible authority for that same polygamy. On dancing, drink, and gambling the Bible is not as specific as the moralists would like to have it. Indeed, to them, the Bible seems quite careless about these matters. Curiously enough, all three, dancing, drink, and gambling, figure largely in the earliest records of religious practices. Dancing is very likely the first religious activity of the human race. In the whirling excitement of it they thought that the will of their gods was much more likely to be made known to them. The first who spoke words that were interpreted as revelation, inspired utterance, were under the influence of the drink of the place and the time. Casting lots, their way of throwing dice, was used to discover what their gods would have them do. Casting lots is used quite generally in the Bible as a way of discovering the Divine Will. This is very interesting, historically, that these practices so prominent in the earliest expression of religion are the three made the test now of being religious at all. The first religionists were fanatically devoted to them, later religionists as fanatically opposed.

The way to decide things is to bring together those who know something about them. Of course Bible people are always dogmatically certain if they think they find anything on their side. Most modern problems have to be dealt with experimentally, with no absolute answer possible. Those who are wise do not expect it. The "crack down, close it up" enforcement school is greatly in favor among Protestants, with Catholicism and the Jewish people usually opposing. This savage enforcement idea stems directly from Luther. It is now quite generally recognized that Fascism has its roots in him. There is Bible authority for Jehovah cracking down on bad cities. We have had letters recently informing us that Jesus will "clamp down" on a lot of people when he comes again. This big stick solution goes usually with those who do not believe in doing the things in dispute at any time. Obviously, it would be difficult to get two groups together in a workable system, if one group is against doing certain things at any time, any place, at any age, and the other group would do them sometimes under some conditions. By necessity, this requires some kind of compromise. People usually are about equally divided politically between the "never do it," school, and those who would do it at times.

Drinking makes most trouble and confusion. There is no one way to deal with it that is satisfactory to all. Some are not long out of the European way of having foods and a drink that always go together. It is a family affair, a public social affair, or a church affair with the clergy present and participating. It is all done in conscience without grim-visaged morality present as skeleton at the feast. This is a real European contribution to civilized living, this having public places where people sit about, eat, drink, and talk according to taste. The churches that became the all-over American churches scotched all this, to assure better attendance at class meeting and prayer meeting. Those who manned these pioneer church movements in the woods had few social graces themselves, and, as far as they were able, shamed out the social amenities in the name of religion. There seems to be no sound reason why Scandinavians cannot do things as urbanely in Duluth as in Copenhagen. These family and folkway customs of national groups were closed out by the two dominant American churches that took over when all the country was rural. Nothing comparable in social interest replaced the old customs that were liquidated.

In time, this church control relaxed in the American social scene. Public authorities were asked to take over where these older controls left off. This makes a situation that has no permanent solution. Ancestral practices and the new freedom of youth both are on the side of doing some things at certain ages. The opposition says that they are not to be done at any age. The discussion is about who are minors in fact and not by calendar age. With all the changes, people begin to do things now about three years earlier than they did. That is, the age at which one ceases to be a minor is in for revision. Some states already are considering lowering the voting age. The War aged those in it with more experiences than would come ordinarily

in a dozen lifetimes. The nation calls upon its minors to do its rough work when it is a matter of keeping a place in which to have a country at all. Men returned from handling real guns to be handed a cap pistol. If people at eighteen can do war on their own they can do other things at home on their own. To be put out of places where men gather, after you have done a man's job in the world, naturally does not set so well. It is sheer impudence on the part of city administrations to allow themselves to be driven by those who feel bound to put soldiers back into a kind of good life that got revised quite a bit in the war experience. You cannot go through the hellholes of the world without having some reactions of your own, about what the good life is and who has the right to define it.

There is no disagreement whatever about what may not be done at certain ages. Public authorities do have some responsibility for what may be done by those outside home, school, and church. This may be a lot of the time now. This responsibility has been thrust upon public authorities whether they like it or not. There is no school in the country that advocates pouring liquor down the throats of infants. There never has been such a school. We listened for a year to all the ways ever suggested for handling liquor distribution, and we never heard this suggested. It is nonsense to say it or to believe it. No one would ever use it unless short of arguments. On this special subject, feeling runs high and words are thrown about wildly. It is always effective to pin murder on the opposition if it can be done. The sure-fire charge, a corrupter of youth, has been standard procedure since the time it was worked successfully on Socrates.

Whatever restrictions are decided upon, they have to bear evenly upon all groups, irrespective of the size of their expenditure and the furnishing of their places. This love of your own gathering place is deep seated, running from the boy-gang places in the woods to the old fellows sitting about in their clubs. The English people are very much given to private clubs with extra privileges legally protected. The private club is an extension of the home, one's castle. It is easy to run into snobbish, class legislation, giving extra privileges, or at least less annoyance, to the well-furnished places.

Some cannot have even the most modest private place, either home or club. They are detached, alone. The same privileges and protection should be given those whose only places are public places. It is easy to put a degree of regulation upon others that anyone of spirit would resent having put upon himself. The time is past when people have to take it. Keeping "the less fortunate" in line is dated.

The boys are just home from giving that sort of thing a sound thrashing. Democracy is here and has to be respected. Our people have become conscious of the power of the vote to get them what they want. They are wanting a lot of different things, and a lot of things different, that never have been demanded before, nor were possible.

Poets, Sing On!

Sing on,
Poets, sing on,
Though nations become dust;
One song can reconstruct a world,
Sing on!

The Study Table

Democratic International Organization

LET'S TALK ABOUT THE PEACE. *By Henry G. Alsberg. New York: Hastings House. 324 pp. $2.75.*

Henry G. Alsberg has spent a good part of his adult life abroad as a reporter of foreign affairs. Through the colander of long years of first hand observation and experience he has squeezed out a residue of conclusions which he sets forth in *Let's Talk About the Peace.*

In many ways he has given us a remarkably interesting book, not only because he exhibits a good grasp of the material which he brings under consideration but also because he takes the trouble to arrange his observations in the form of a dialogue between an imaginary lecturer and an imaginary G.I. Clumsily as this literary device is handled it does succeed in sloughing off some of the droning monotony of so many of the recent books that attempt to tell us of the true ways of preserving peace.

Alsberg wrote his book before the United Nations Organization was actually established, but he had the Dumbarton Oaks proposals in his hands, and therefore much of what he has to say retains its relevancy. In general agreement with most of the rest of us, he claims that the power of the Dumbarton Oaks organization to prevent wars rests on the thin thread of continuing unanimity among the Big Five, a thread that is already being dangerously over-extended by the practice of power politics "as usual."

Actually not one of the big powers has any illusions about the potentiality of the Dumbarton organization, says the author. Otherwise how could we explain the armaments race which is already under way. He asks the pertinent question: "Who is the enemy against which all nations are arming?" Surely not against the Axis powers who could now be kept disarmed with relative ease. The answer then must be that they are arming against each other because they lack confidence in a world organization designed along Dumbarton Oaks lines. If this were not the case, the victor nations would be disarming, rather than the reverse.

The author states his belief that a remedy could be found in an international organization which is truly democratic, that is, in one in which the power to prevent wars is removed from the foreign offices "which have never prevented any wars," and is given to the people, who have "every reason for wanting to prevent wars, since they have to pay for them in suffering and blood."

Mr. Alsberg would accomplish this by having the "New League" set up by delegates elected directly by the people. Delegates responsible to the people directly

would then be subject to popular pressure for peace and would be more likely to formulate and champion adequate measures to prevent wars. As the author expresses it: "If they, the representatives, do not respond to the demands of their constituencies, they won't be re-elected. Other representatives, more responsive to the popular will, will be elected in their place."

Before coming to his formulation of a democratic International Organization, which in terms of the present U.N.O. would greatly strengthen the General Assembly and abolish the Security Council, Mr. Alsberg takes the reader through 22 chapters dealing competently with subjects ranging all the way from "The Big Five and the Rest of the World" to "Subject Peoples" and "Hands Off Revolution."

The book has a refreshing atmosphere about it which only an intelligent old-line newspaper reporter could impart.

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

The Courage of Jews

THE FIGHTING JEW. *By Ralph Nunberg. With an Introduction by Curt Riess. New York: Creative Age Press. 295 pp. $2.50.*

It is but another part of the age-old tragedy of prejudice that such a book as this needed to be written. Its title is misleading, yet here it is—a document presented in a simple, vivid style, but actually the fruit of enormous research and considerable erudition. It might better have been entitled *The Soldier Jew.*

We are constantly being surprised that some noted artist, scientist, or Supreme Court Justice turns out to be of Jewish origin, yet, by and large, we are more familiar with the Jewish contribution in peaceful pursuits than we are with their participation in things military. The old myth of Jewish cowardice was resurrected in this war as it has often been before, and Ralph Nunberg, an outstanding Berlin journalist before Hitler's rise to power, has taken upon himself the task of unmasking this legend.

Jewish soldiers, since the breakup of their nation, have usually been identified with the country for which they fought. They wanted it that way, and many of them may resent the isolation of statistics like those in this book, partly through modesty and partly because military activity seems to have been one area where their racial and religious heritage was merged more readily with national patriotisms than elsewhere. Yet the legend of Jewish cowardice is still upon the lips of Gentiles, and this book needed to be written. Some of its astounding statements and statistics I shall quote more or less at random in order to give a notion of the material.

Twenty-four Jews arrived in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam in 1654. Peter Stuyvesant wrote the directors of the Dutch West India Company a complaining letter about them shortly thereafter, but these directors manifested an unusual vision of the fact that certain principles and ideals were at stake and dared to oppose the stubborn governor. The Jews stayed on and eventually made a respected place for themselves in the colony.

By 1776 there were 3,000 Jews in the thirteen colonies, including women and children. That meant less than a thousand men capable of carrying arms. Yet 600 of that number fought through the whole Revolutionary War.

When John Brown set out to free the slaves he was accompanied by three Jews. Eight thousand Jews later fought in the Union Army. Four of them were promoted to generalships.

Napoleon had great respect and excellent relations with the Jews, according them full citizenship in France and in the other countries which he conquered. One of his greatest military leaders, his first and most important marshal, Andrea Massena, was a Jew. Napoleon later called him "one of the greatest men of his age."

In World War I the number of Jews enlisted in the various European armies in every case was higher in proportion than their relative number within the population.

> Only in the United States were the participation and the sacrifice of non-Jews equal to those of the Jews. In other countries . . . . the Jews furnished a greater proportion of dead and wounded. Such figures obviously give the lie to the old story that Jews are cowards and prefer to have others fight their battles for them.

Had World War I continued longer than it did, a British general of Jewish extraction, Sir John Monash, would undoubtedly have been chosen to succeed General Haig, according to Mr. Nunberg.

The figures and brief biographies of known and un-

(*Continued on page* 15)

The Field

(*Continued from page* 2)

Peace Day will be celebrated again the next year, and the next, and the next. Each year on this same day this same pledge will be made. The yearly re-commitment of men everywhere, as "We, the people of the United Nations" pledge and repledge our loyalty to the ideal of peace, will build the firm confidence and conviction which will make possible the solution of even the most critical situations by peaceful means. Neither time nor tide in the affairs of the world can weaken such faith and such promises when they are made by so many men of good will.

Also, each year in some one of the United Nations a city or town will be chosen for the official observance of the day by the presidents, premiers, rulers and kings of *all the participating nations.* The choice of the nation for this principal scene of re-avowal will be most thoughtfully made. The nation may be chosen because it has made an especially significant contribution to the cause of peace. It may be one which has just become a member of the United Nations. It may be a country which has been slow to join the peace-loving states. It may be a member nation which is tempted to ignore its promises of peace. This re-dedication will not, of course, be a legal reënactment of the Charter but its solemnity and the participation of presidents and rulers will be a vivid demonstration that the promise of the powers has not been forgotten or ignored.

It will be Peace Day in New York City, Bisbee, Toronto, Paris, and in Stoke-on-Trent. It will be Peace Day in Chungking, Moscow, Narvik, Capetown, Sydney, and Buenos Aires. It will be Peace Day in all the United Nations.

And Peace Day will follow the sun around the earth, the people of the United Nations putting aside their ordinary tasks for a time to dedicate themselves anew to the cause of a peaceful world—a world in which they can carry on their ordinary tasks day by day free from the threat of war.—*Committee for Peace Day in the United Nations,* 25 *Beacon St., Boston* 8, *Mass.*

The Study Table

(*Continued from page* 14)

known Jewish heroes continue, and there is not room enough here to mention even the most important. Of the Russian generals in World War II, 313 were Jewish; and some 31,000 Jews gave their lives in defense of that Poland where their presence was so violently unwelcome. Their part in the second World War was even more startling than in the first because they regarded it in a special way as *their* war. Now that it is over, we are told that anti-Semitism which we abhorred in Germany is increasing rapidly even in this country. If such books as this can give us a clearer perspective and a few figures with which to combat this disease, let us also recommend it to our friends!

ELEANOR DARNELL WALLACE.

Fateful Years

BETWEEN TWO WARS. *The Failure of Education. 1920-1940. By Porter Sargent. Boston, Mass., (11 Beacon Street): Porter Sargent. $5.00.*

This book contains the intellectual history of those twenty fateful years which began with utopian hopes after the first World War, saw the crash and the following depression, turned to new confidence in scientific understanding and in reconstruction of our culture on that basis, only to fail finally in reaction and another war.

Porter Sargent has collected and admirably summed up an astonishing amount of information on the currents and the ideas produced during that period by the natural and social sciences and by the humanities. Whoever looks for knowledge of the achievements or failures of the period between the two wars will hardly find a better source or collection of sources than the one that is provided here. But the book contains much more. The author has had a lifelong, intimate connection with the other nations of this one world and with scientific research, particularly in biology. This accounts for the broad-minded and searching analysis to which he subjects all the problems of our time. It results in the debunking of empty escapism and reaction from whatever respectable source or place in the American scientific and educational hierarchy it may emanate, in a renewed confidence in tested truth, and in the advocacy of a genuinely progressive attitude.

FRITZ KARSEN.

Two Saints and a Man of Letters

AN AUGUSTINE SYNTHESIS. *By Erich Przywara.* New *York: Sheed and Ward. 496 pp. $3.50.*

A NEWMAN SYNTHESIS. *By Erich Przywara. New York: Sheed and Ward. 379 pp. $3.50.*

SAINT IGNATIUS. *By Christopher Hollis. New York: Sheed and Ward. 287 pp. $2.50.*

Many books and divers interpretations have been given over the years for each of the three men who are again presented to this troubled age. What have they to say to the totally new problems of today? St. Augustine has much to say. He is as eternal as daylight. He may be in eclipse at times, but he always comes back. He, too, lived in a troubled time, and his immortal *City of God* has much to offer even to this "atomic age." The great historic branches of Christianity trace their doctrine through him. If there should ever be a united Christendom, it would have to reckon with St. Augustine. Przywara's anthology from the great Saint's many books is profitable reading for anyone. When we come to Newman we at once land in the midst of propaganda which Przywara's anthology from the Cardinal's writings is. Hollis' *Saint Ignatius* is, in many ways, a fresh approach to another great life. This biography is valuable in that it takes account of the influence of Islam on Ignatius' thinking, for, surely, his writings can be understood only in the light of the great Islamic theology. This is important as we are about to see a renaissance of Islam. A portion of Ignatius' great spiritual exercises is a direct adaptation from Islam. This deserves further study. Another matter touched upon is Ignatius' relation to the thought of Erasmus who, at one time, was widely read in Spain. This, too, deserves further treatment. Hollis' work is provocative and he deserves a thoughtful reading.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Victory

Who is the enemy and what is he?
What did they go forth to conquer, to drive from the earth, to annihilate with the terror of their loathing?
I know—
It was hate and cruelty, it was oppression and bigotry
That would throw human beings down in the mud, and trample them in orgies of lust.

God granted them victory—our men who went into all the world with fire and blood to preach the gospel of freedom.
And God grant—oh this is my fear now—

I know their victory of arms.
I hear its echoes.
I see the sky alight with its fires;
Its singing is in the wind!
Its beating is in my heart;
My working nerves keep time to its tramping.

But God grant—and this is still my fear—
That when they come home with the enemy beaten,
Ready to rest, to take up the fruits of triumph and enjoy their well-won better world—

God grant that they do not meet that same enemy at home—
Entrenched in places sacred to them.
Sitting at directors' tables,
Shouting over radio,
Distilling poison slime of printer's ink,
Holding high places in government,
Revelling thoughtlessly in gilded parlors,
Smiling hypocritically at the doors of their churches,
Sitting smugly in palaces on bluffs
Above low streets where crowds mill in dismay.

God grant that when they have driven the enemy from his lairs all over the world
They do not have to walk arm in arm with him down the streets of their own home town!

SHELDON SHEPARD.

Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

MR. HILTON'S ITINERARY, DEC. 17 TO MARCH 17.

Dec. 17-19: Sioux City, Iowa.
Jan. 8-10: Boston, Mass.
Jan. 14-16: Sioux City, Iowa.
Jan. 20: Rockford, Illinois.
Jan. 28: Western Conference Board Meeting.
Feb. 1: Meadville Theological School
Beverly (Chicago) Pulpit Committee.
Feb. 7: Evanston, Chicago Associate Alliance.
Feb. 8: Chicago Unitarian Council.
Feb. 10: Bloomington, Illinois.
Feb. 14-15: Denver, Colorado.
Feb. 17: Wichita, Kansas.
Feb. 18-19: Iowa City, Iowa.
Feb. 24: Flint, Mich.
Feb. 25: Grosse Point, Mich.
Feb. 26: Detroit, Mich.
March 2-4: Moline, Illinois.
March 11-14: Boston, Mass.

WALKER INSTALLED

On Sunday afternoon, February 10, Rev. Kenneth C. Walker was installed as minister of the First Unitarian Church of Bloomington, Illinois. The Act of Installation was conducted by Mrs. Florence Fifer Bohrer, Chairman of the Board of the Bloomington church. Prof. H. H. Schroeder responded on behalf of the congregation. Rev. Philip Schug of Urbana read the scripture. Rev. Randall S. Hilton gave the charges to the minister and the congregation, and was the presiding officer for the service. Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Dean of Abraham Lincoln Centre and President of the Western Unitarian Conference, gave the installation prayer and delivered the sermon.

EVANSTON

During the absence of Rev. John Nicholls Booth, who has been doing some special work for the United Unitarian Appeal, the Evanston pulpit was occupied by Rev. Dale DeWitt (2 Sundays), Regional Director of the Middle Atlantic States; Rev. Philip Schug of Urbana; and Rev. E. T. Buehrer of the Third Church, Chicago.

IOWA CITY

Rev. Evans Worthley, minister of the Unitarian Church of Iowa City, is president of the Iowa City Ministerial Association.

On February 18 and 19, Mr. Worthley and the Iowa City church were hosts to the annual conference of the Iowa-Nebraska ministers.

COLORADO SPRINGS

Rev. Hurley Begun is a member of the school board of Colorado Springs.

The Colorado Springs church is planning to continue its services all through the summer with a special guest preacher during July and August.

WICHITA

The Wichita church continues to progress. A unique and interesting feature of its church service is a children's choir.

Mr. Anthony Holloway, son of the Rev. W. Rupert Holloway, minister of the Wichita church, returned last month after spending thirty-two months overseas in the South Pacific and China with the U. S. Marine Corps.

DENVER SPECIAL

As announced last month the Western Conference Annual Meetings will be held in Denver, May 31-June 2. Churches should begin planning now to send delegates. Railroad reservations to Denver, going either by the way of Chicago or St. Louis, can be facilitated by making them through the Western Unitarian Conference Office.

DES MOINES

Rev. Grant Butler has been made the chairman of the UNRRA Food Drive. The Unitarian church is the collection center.

On Brotherhood Sunday, February 17, the church heard Mr. Alvin Cannon preach at the morning service. Mr. Cannon is one of our most promising Negro leaders and is a graduate of the Starr King School for the Ministry.

PROCTOR ACADEMY

Proctor Academy, a Unitarian school for boys and located at Andover, New Hampshire, is to celebrate its centennial in 1948. At the present time the school is conducting a drive for a $200,000 Centennial Fund. The fund will be used to enlarge the facilities of the school and for scholarships.

LESLIE PENNINGTON

Rev. Leslie Pennington, minister of the First Unitarian Church of Chicago, spent the last week in February at Rollins College, Florida, where he gave a series of talks. During his absence his pulpit was occupied by Dr. Charles Hartshorne of the University of Chicago.

TOLEDO

Among those who preached at the Toledo church, while the minister, Rev. Arthur Olsen, was away on a special mission for the United Unitarian Appeal, were Chaplain Robert Weston and Rev. Dilworth Lupton.

MID-WEST COLLEGE SEMINAR

The Mid-West Unitarian College Seminar was held March 2 and 3 in Detroit. The Seminar discussed the problems of Religious Education in the Public Schools.

McCULLOM vs. CHAMPAIGN SCHOOL BOARD

The first round of the McCullom case has been lost. The court upheld this violation of the separation of church and state. However, an appeal is to be taken. Mr. Walter F. Dodd, a Chicago attorney specializing in constiutional law, will prosecute the appeal.

WESTERN CONFERENCE

Annual Meeting—May 31 to June 2—Denver, Colorado.

Summer Assembly—August 18 to 25—College Camp, Lake Geneva, Wisconsin.